



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXII.—THE *PALATINE PASSION* AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PASSION PLAY

The similarities of phrase, arrangement, and general development that are to be observed in so many mediæval religious plays in which divergences are nevertheless equally apparent have been variously explained as due to the common scriptural, liturgical, theological, or vernacular sources of these plays. Nor has the possibility that one play or cycle may have borrowed directly from another been overlooked. The paucity of early texts, however, contrasted with the relatively more abundant remains of the later highly developed plays and cycles, has tended to obscure the whole problem. With the recent discovery and publication¹ of the oldest text of a complete French Passion play that has survived—the manuscript is dated from the beginning of the fourteenth century by Dr. Christ—new data has become available, and it can be shown, I think, from the relations existing between this so-called *Palatine Passion* and other French Passion plays that many of the puzzling resemblances in the medieval drama

¹ By Karl Christ, who edits it as: "Das altfranzösische Passions-spiel der Palatina" in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XL, pp. 405-488. The two manuscripts of the *Autun Passion* were not accessible to Dr. Christ and the *Passion des Jongleurs* was known to him only in the prose redaction of Jean d'Outremeuse and the mutilated version included in the so-called *Roman de S. Fanieul* published in *Revue des langues romanes* XXVIII (1885). Had he seen the Paris MSS. and the versions of the epic poem published by Foster, Theben and Pfuhl (see note 8, *infra*) he would doubtless not have suggested (pp. 413, 415) that the similarities between the *Palatine Passion*, the *Passion d'Autun* and the *Passion de Semur* may emanate from their common dependence upon the *Passion des Jongleurs*.

arise from the fact that the same texts often served as the basis for the representations given in different communities. These texts were at various times subjected to revision, and it is the successive alterations made upon them which have in many cases concealed their original connections.

The earliest manuscripts of French Passion plays hitherto signalled are the short fragment of only eighty-seven lines from Sion published by M. Bédier in *Romania*, xxiv, pp. 86 ff. and dated between the end of the thirteenth and middle of the fourteenth centuries, the Provençal Passion contained in the Didot manuscript,² dated 1345, and the so-called *Passion d'Autun* described by M. Roy in *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle* (Dijon and Paris, 1903), pp. 40* ff. from two manuscripts (Bibliothèque Nationale, n. a. fr. 4085 and 4356), both dating from the fifteenth century.³

That the *Palatine Passion* is related to the fragment from Sion published by M. Bédier and to the *Passion d'Autun*⁴ there can be no doubt. That the two latter

² From the published extracts and discussions of this manuscript I have been unable to establish any connection between it and the *Palatine Passion*. Cf. Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, II, 351; *Le Monde*, April 14, 1876; *Revue des langues romanes*, x, 158; xvii, 303; xxviii, 8-23, 53-65; xxxii, 343; *Bibliothèque meridionale*, Serie I, vol. 3, pp. xvi ff.; *Ztschr. f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* xvii², 210, and Emile Streblow, *Das Mystère de Semur*, Greifswald, 1905.

³ Through the kindness of M. Lucien Foulet I was able to obtain photographs of these manuscripts. Extracts from them may also be found in the articles by Schumacher (*Romania*, xxxvii, 570) and Jeanroy (*Journal des Savants*, 1906, 476).

⁴ See Christ, *op. cit.* p. 483, note to l. 1724. For the purposes of the following comparison, the *Autun Passion* may be regarded as being preserved in MS. Bib. Nat. n. a. fr. 4085. The related manuscript n. a. fr. 4356 (an incomplete and in general much abbreviated version, though containing some incidents not found in n. a. fr. 4085)

texts are themselves related has already been pointed out by M. Roy.⁵ To what extent the Palatine and Autun

parallels the latter closely in those parts related to the *Palatine Passion*, and the very few independent parallels between the Palatine text and n. a. fr. 4356 which are not in n. a. fr. 4085 can be explained as due to the intermediate source or sources from which all three mss. derive. Thus n. a. fr. 4356 contains reminiscences (some quite faint) of the following lines of the *Palatine Passion*, none of which occur in n. a. fr. 4085: 85, 94, 141-2, 272 (the healing of Malchus is omitted in n. a. fr. 4085), 582, 762-3, but some of these lines derive from the *Passion des Jongleurs* and others quite evidently disappeared from n. a. fr. 4085 when the narrative passages were inserted in that version. The scenes of n. a. fr. 4356 which are not in n. a. fr. 4085 (notably the foot-washing and Veronica incidents) are also absent from the Palatine text. They may be original contributions by the editor of n. a. fr. 4356, or, since they also occur in the *Passion des Jongleurs*, they may have been present in some common ancestor of n. a. fr. 4085 and 4356. The latter ends with Joseph's request that Nicodemus assist at the entombment.

⁵ His tendency, however, to regard the Sion fragment and n. a. fr. 4356 as practically one text seems to me not altogether happy. In discussing the versions of the *Passion d'Autun* contained in MS. n. a. fr. 4085, M. Roy hazarded the interesting conjecture that the original *Passion d'Autun* may have been designed not for an ordinary dramatic performance but for the use of jongleurs with histrionic talents equal to the assumption of many different roles (*op. cit.*, p. 53*). He was led to this conclusion by the large number of purely narrative lines imbedded in MS. n. a. fr. 4085. M. Fr. Schumacher, however, plausibly suggested in *Romania*, xxxvii, pp. 592-3, that the work was originally dramatic rather than narrative in form and that the narrative passages of this particular manuscript are due to *remaniements*. M. Schumacher's conclusions are supported not only by the relation of this text to that in MS. Bib. Nat. n. a. fr. 4356, to the Sion fragment, and to the *Palatine Passion*, none of which has these narrative passages (the four narrative passages in the Palatine text are in no way related), but especially by the fact that although n. a. fr. 4085 derives from the old narrative *Passion des Jongleurs*, its narrative passages are not taken from that poem. See A. Jeanroy, *Mystères français de la Passion*, *Romania*, xxxv, 369. M. Jeanroy indeed was led by this fact — and by M. Roy's failure to cite the other parallels between the two texts that do exist — to doubt whether they were related. Of this relationship,

Passions derive from the play represented by the Sion fragment remains uncertain, but that they do not derive from each other can, I think, be proved.

Unfortunately, the Sion fragment is so short that inferences based upon resemblances to it must be made with caution. This much is clear, however. In the passages common to all three texts, the Palatine and Autun *Passions* have no agreeing lines which are not also found in the fragment. Both *Passions*, however, fail to include lines 34-35 of the fragment. If the play represented by the Sion fragment were their source, this omission could only be explained as fortuitous, but if we suppose their source to have been not the very text preserved in the fragment, but either (1) the source of that fragment or (2) a derivative of it, all relations between the three manuscripts at this point are satisfactorily explained.

Whatever the degree of their relationship to it, therefore, the play represented by the Sion fragment may be regarded as a more or less remote ancestor of these two complete texts. The nature of their individual agreements with it, moreover, establishes the fact that it is from some such common ancestor that they derive, and not from each other. Thus although the extensive parallels between the fragment and the *Autun Passion* include scenes and verbal coincidences which are wanting in the *Palatine Passion*,⁶ nevertheless the Palatine text in at

however, there can be no question (see *infra*). The narrative passages in n. a. fr. 4085 therefore are later additions to a text originally dramatic, and were probably designed to adapt it for recitation or reading.

⁶ The lines of the fragment which appear in n. a. fr. 4085 and not in the Palatine manuscript are lines 1-25, 38-9, and 43-end. The concluding "sermon" of the fragment, however, is expanded to twice its length by the Autun text. In the fragment and the Autun text, the awakening of the knights immediately follows the Descen-

least three lines (1726, 1728, and 1731) resembles the fragment more closely than the *Autun Passion* does, line 1731 indeed corresponding to line 33 of the Sion fragment for which the Autun text presents no parallel. Evidently, therefore, neither play can have served as the source of the other.

This fact, however, emerges even more clearly from the relations existing between these two Passions and their more remote source, the Old French narrative poem sometimes called the *Passion des Jongleurs*. M. Roy suggested ⁷ that the author of the *Autun Passion* apparently knew this poem, and I have tried to show elsewhere how largely the Palatine play made use of it.⁸ In the *Palatine Passion* in fact long passages from the narrative *Passion* are incorporated almost verbatim, and the parallels between the two texts are not only much closer but much more extended than between the narrative poem and the *Passion d'Autun*.⁹ In other words, the *Palatine Passion* gives the impression of being in parts quite directly de-

scus; in the *Palatine Passion*, which places the Descensus earlier, several scenes intervene.

⁷ *Loc. cit.* p. 46*.

⁸ *Modern Language Notes*, xxxv, 257 ff. The *Passion des Jongleurs* is printed with variants by H. Theben, *Die altfranzösische Achtsilbnerredaktion der Passion*, Greifswald, 1909 and by E. Pfuhl (who continues Theben's work), *Die weitere Fassung der altfranzösischen Dichtung in achtsilbigen Reimpaaren über Christi Höllenfahrt und Auferstehung (Fortsetzung der eigentlichen Passion) nach 5 Hss. in Cambridge, Paris und Turin*, Greifswald, 1909. For an excellent treatment of the sources of this poem, for a discussion of the relations existing between the various mss., and for a text of it printed from a ms. not used by Theben and Pfuhl, see Frances A. Foster, *The Northern Passion*, Early English Text Society, 1916, vol. 147, pp. 49 ff. and 102 ff.

⁹ In the scenes common to all three texts, the *Autun Passion* very rarely contains lines derived from the narrative poem which are not in the *Palatine Passion*.

pendent upon the *Passion des Jongleurs*, whereas the dependence of the *Passion d'Autun* is apparently often obscured by its distance from this source.¹⁰ Of the 189 lines of the narrative poem (cited as "O. F. P.") which are printed in *Modern Language Notes* xxxv, 260 ff. as parallel to lines in the *Palatine Passion*, only fifty are to be found in Bib. Nat. n. a. fr. 4085 (fewer still in n. a. fr. 4356).¹¹ Some of these appear in the Autun text almost unchanged (notably O. F. P. 147-52, 154, 187-90, 1038, 1040, 667-8, and 1043-4) but others show every evidence of the ravages of time. A few examples of the latter will perhaps serve to indicate what has happened:

Compare Pal. 363-84 = O. F. P. 889-909, 923-4 with

¹⁰ Any assumption that the two plays *independently* adopted portions of the narrative poem is rendered unlikely by the presence in both of them of parallel lines and scenes which do not derive from that poem, as well as by the occurrence and non-occurrence to so large an extent in both of them of the *same* passages, similarly transposed, taken from the poem. The possibility, however, that the Palatine branch of the common tradition borrowed from the poem a second time—after its separation from the version giving rise to the Autun texts—seems to me not altogether remote.

¹¹ These fifty lines are: O. F. P. 147-52, 154, 187-90, 198-9, 213-4, 234, 469-70, 492, 494, 594-5, 895-6, 900-2, 1038, 1040, 667-8, 1043-4, 1066, 1068a-b, 1059-60, 1077b, 1083-4, 1459-61, 1463, 1436a-38, 1453-4. It will be observed that often when the Pauline text incorporates a long passage of the O. F. P. the Autun text preserves only a few lines.

Only the more striking parallels between the O. F. P. and Pal. were printed in *Modern Language Notes* xxxv, (cf. p. 259), and among those not cited are the following which contain lines common to all three texts: Cf. O. F. P. 55-80 with Pal. 83-96 and n. a. fr. 4085 (cited hereafter as A), fol. 146 r; cf. O. F. P. 706 with Pal. 519 and A. fol. 151 v; O. F. P. 1056, 1056 c = Pal. 690-92 = A. fol. 156 r; O. F. P. 1190-1 = Pal. 695-6 = A. fol. 156 r; O. F. P. 1063-4 = Pal. 696-7 = A. fol. 156 r; O. F. P. 1065-8 = Pal. 701-3 = A. 156 v; O. F. P. 1290-1308 = Pal. 787-825 = A. fol. 157 v; O. F. P. 1307-8 = Pal. 825-9 = A. 158 r; O. F. P. 1400-2 = Pal. 961-4 = A. fol. 160 r.

the eight lines which alone represent this passage in the Autun MS. (n. a. fr. 4085), fol. 154 r and v (= Pal. 369-77 = O. F. P. 895-903):

Palatine Passion

[Herode]

Or ça, a moy, amis Jhesu! 363
 Que par .c. fois bien vieignes tu,
 Et cil ait bien qui ça t'envoie!
 C'est Pilates que tant heoie.
 Je ne le hé mais de noient;
 Je li pardoin mon mal talent.
 Mout a lonc tens que je voloie 369
 Parle[r] a toy mais ne pooie.
 Ne sai pour paour ou pour quoi
 N'osoies venir devant moy.
 J'ai oï dire par ton seignacle
 A on veü maint biau miracle: 374
 Li mort en sont resuscité,
 Et li avugle ralumé,
 Et maint autre que fait avez,
 Je en ai oï souvent parler.
 Or m'en fai .i. apertement 379
 Si que voient toute la gent,
 Et je tel plait après ferai
 Que tout delivre te rendrai.
 Enseigne nous ou bien ou mal.—

383

Bien voi que tu n'en feras al.

Old French Passion

Herode voit venir Jesu, 889
 Il li a dit: "Bien vieignes tu,
 Et chil ait bien qui cha t'envoie!
 C'est Pilate que je haoie.
 Or li pardoins mon maltalent,
 Or nel harai ge mais noient.
 Moult a grant tans que je voloie
 Parler a toi, més ne pooie;
 Car ne venoies devant moi,
 Ne sai pour paour ou pourquoi.
 Et je sai bien par ton seignacle
 A l'en veü mainte miracle: 900
 Li mort en sont resuscité
 Li avule renluminé,
 Et maint autre que fait avés
 Dont j'ai oï parler assés.
 Mès or m'en fai .I. em present, 905
 Si que le voient toute la gent.
 Et je ferai tel plait après,
 Que tu remaindras tout em pais."
 "Enseigne nous ou mal ou bien!"

923

Jesus ne repont nulle rien.

Passion d'Autun

Moul[t] long temps a que je voloie
 A toy parler mais ne pouroye.
 Je scay pour voir par ton visaige
 Qu'es gens as fait maintes miracle.
 Tu as les mors resusitez
 Et les dyables des corps gectez,
 Maintes miracles tu as fait,
 J'en suis certain que m'as tu fait.

Compare Pal. 947-52 = O. F. P. 1459-64 with the four lines in n. a. fr. 4085, fol. 161 r which alone represent these six:

Palatine Passion

[Cayfas]

C'est cil qui le temple abatra 947 "C'est chil qui le temple abatra 1459

Et en .iij. jourz le refera.	Et en .III. jours refait l'avra.
Se tu es fuiz a Dieu le pere,	Se tu es fils al roi del mont,
Ne te laissier en tel maniere,	Et se tu dois sauver le mont,
Mais de cele croys descent jus!	De cele crois car descent jus!
De nous croira en toy li plus. 952	De nous crera en toi li plus. 1464

Passion d'Autun

Tu dis que le temple Dieu destrura
 Et en troys jours le reffera.
 Se tu es filz de Dieu tout puissant
 Maintenant de la croix descent.

On the other hand, the *Autun Passion* contains a number of details deriving from the *Passion des Jongleurs*—some involving verbal reminiscences—which are not to be found in the *Palatine Passion*; and occasionally in the sequence of scenes the Autun text agrees with the narrative poem when the Palatine text does not.¹² In some

¹² Thus n. a. fr. 4085 and O. F. P. contain Judas' reference to the poor (fol. 147 r; O. F. P. 93-4); the correct figure for the deniers, 300 (fol. 146 v; O. F. P. 92a); two lines echoing O. F. P. 200-1, MSS. SO' (fol. 147 v); the prediction of Peter's betrayal (fol. 148 r; 337-44, two lines very like); the dream of Pilate's wife (fol. 152 v; 1020 ff.); the purchase of the field of blood (153 r; 843); Pilate's reason for sending Jesus to Herod (153 v; 879-80, these lines quite parallel); the road to Calvary and Simon's bearing of the cross (159 v; 1317 ff.); and finally the speeches of the good and bad thieves and Jesus' reply to them (163 v; 1481-96, some eight lines similar), all of which are wanting in the Palatine text. Moreover, several scenes appear in their scriptural position in O. F. P. and 4085 which have been shifted in Pal.: the blindfolding and buffeting of Jesus during the trial before Caiaphas; the denial of Peter; the second trial before Pilate; the casting of the lots; and finally both O. F. P. and Autun seem to follow *John* xix, 29-30 in making *consummatus* est follow *spongiam plenam acete*, whereas in Pal. the Longinus scene intervenes. (The difference between the Gospels and the fact that two drinks are mentioned probably account for the fact that all three

instances, to be sure, such agreements may be accidental, due to the scriptural and theological sources underlying all the texts, but in others it seems clear that the Palatine playwright has eliminated certain elements that were present in the parent-play from which both these versions descend. One must again assume, therefore, that the Palatine and Autun *Passions*, as we know them, derive not from each other but from some common source.

Were the similarities between the two texts confined to those scenes that are related to the narrative poem and the Sion fragment, we should have no difficulty in positing one or the other, or both, as that source. But the agreement is much more extended. In fact, of the 1996 lines of the *Palatine Passion*, nearly one-seventh bear a distinct verbal resemblance to lines in the *Passion d'Autun*, and such similarities in phraseology occur not only in the more conventional scenes, common to the liturgical as well as to the vernacular plays, but also in scenes that constitute a purely dramatic extension of the story.¹³

versions are at variance in the order of the events following the Crucifixion. The various mss. of the O. F. P. themselves differ. Cf. Theben's notes to ll. 1390 and 1404.)

¹³ Notably in the scene between Peter and the host; the Planctus of Mary Magdalene before anointing Jesus; John and Peter in the courtyard; the scene at the smith's (these three episodes are in germ in the O. F. P.); the hanging of the two thieves; the second Planctus Mariae and Joseph's reply; Pilate's reply to Joseph's request (but Pilate's long apology for his action is not in Pal.); the scene between Joseph and Nicodemus (in part); Annas' dispatch of his servant to Caiaphas and the following scene between Annas and Caiaphas; the boasting of the knights; the angel's summons, and the effect of the Resurrection upon the knights. Two scenes which differ in position and development in the two texts nevertheless contain reminiscent lines: the casting of the lots (they feast and throw dice in Autun), and the Longinus episode (much longer in Autun and differently conceived, but in both versions Longinus pierces the side

The conclusion is therefore inevitable that we do not possess the immediate source of the *Palatine Passion*. Another play, or other plays, must have existed that occasioned those similarities between the Autun and Palatine *Passions* which (1) do not derive from any dependence of one text upon the other and (2) are not due to their common dependence upon the narrative *Passion des Jongleurs*. Whether or not the Sion fragment represents such a play we cannot say—too small a part of it has survived. It may have given rise to this source or itself have been derived from it. That such a play, however, was largely influenced by the narrative poem cannot be doubted.

In this connection the question naturally presents itself:

of Jesus before his death).

The most noteworthy differences between the two versions are: 1) the absence from the Palatine text of the prologue, the prophecy of Peter's betrayal, the foot-washing scene (only in n. a. fr. 4356), the dream of Pilate's wife, the *preudome* seeking an *aes pour la teste Jhesu repouser*, the scene between the daughters of Jerusalem and Jesus, the Veronica incident (these two only in 4356), the march to Calvary, the speeches of the thieves and Jesus' reply, Mary's rehearsal of the scenes preceding the Crucifixion, Pilate's excuses to Joseph for his action, the placing of the stone before the tomb by one of the knights, the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary Magdalene, and the concluding *sermon*; 2) the absence from the Autun version of the four introductory lines in the Palatine text, the greetings of the *enfant d' Israel*, the angel's words (ll. 184-191), the missing pieces of silver, the scenes involving Cayn and Huitacelin, Pilate and Joel, Moses and Haquin, the long *diablerie*, the various stanzaic *Planctus*, the Spice-merchant, the three Maries at the tomb and Peter's meeting with them; 3) the different development (and in some instances the different positions) of the scene in the garden of Gethsemane, the bargain of Judas, the capture, the healing of Malchus, the trial before Caiaphas, the despair of Judas, the scourging, the casting of the lots, the Crucifixion (in *Pal.* Jesus is nailed to the raised cross; in n. a. fr. 4085 the cross is raised later,—an addition due to the redactor responsible for the narrative passages in this version), the Longinus episode, the harrowing of Hell, and the Resurrection.

what were the circumstances that produced the tangled series of similarities and dissimilarities in these various related texts? A clue to the answer may perhaps be found in the statement by Petit de Julleville: "aucun mystère ne fut représenté aussi souvent que *la Passion*, le mystère par excellence; depuis le commencement du XIV^e siècle jusqu'à l'époque de la Renaissance, nous en connaissons plus de cent représentations données dans toutes les villes de France, et quelquefois dans de simples bourgs."¹⁴

Did each city, each little village, have its own separate Passion play? We know, of course, that for obvious reasons the liturgical plays followed the same general development the world over, even the more expanded ones retaining to a large extent the same phrasing in widely separated localities.¹⁵ We also know that "au mois de mars 1523 (1524 n. st.) les Dijonnais avaient emprunté *la Résurrection* du chapitre de Besançon" (Roy, *op. cit.* 76*); that in 1490 the chaplain of the guild of St. George at New Romney, Kent, went to see a play at Lydd with a view to reproducing it at home.¹⁶ We know too that the later French Passion plays are little more than compila-

¹⁴ *Le théâtre en France*, pp. 19-20. Cf. also the records in *Les Mystères*, vol. II, 1 ff., and in E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, II, Appendix W.

¹⁵ Cf. e. g. the Rouen, Friesing and Orleans Christmas plays, conveniently compared in Charles Davidson's *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, Yale dissertation, 1892, pp. 50 ff. One must of course assume considerable "borrowing" within the church—which may have served as a precedent.

¹⁶ Chambers, *op. cit.* II, 386. Intercourse of a different nature is revealed by the presence of Wakefield, Donnington and London, actors at York (L. T. Smith, *York Plays*, p. xxxviii), and by the fact that the wardrobe of the Chelmsford players was loaned to other communities for their plays (Chambers, II, 347). That actors might become "carriers" has often been posited. See Hohlfeld, *Anglia*, XI, 258.

tions of scenes plundered from the earlier ones—the relations existing between the two Valenciennes *Passions* and their sources, and between the *Passions* of Jean Michel and Greban, of Arras and Semur bear abundant witness to this fact.¹⁷ The *Passion de Semur* was itself a generous borrower.¹⁸ In England the situation is similar. Numerous points of contact between individual plays in the five great religious cycles have been pointed out, and in four of them the same play (*Christ and the Doctors*)¹⁹ appears in essentially the same form. Two of the cycles, moreover, seem to be so closely related, despite their many divergences, that it has recently been conjectured that they were originally identical.²⁰ An analogous situation exists

¹⁷ Cf. B. Koeppen, *Die beiden Valenciennner Passionen in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Quellen*, Greifswald, 1911; E. Franke, *Untersuchung über das Mystere de la Conception et Nativité de la glorieuse Vierge Marie avesques le mariage d'icelle, la nativité, passion, resurrection et ascension. . . Jesucrist, jouee a Paris, 1507*, Greifswald, 1907; K. Kruse, *Jean Michel, Das Mystère de la Passion Jesu Christ . . . und sein Verhältnis zu der Passion von Arnould Greban u. zu d. beiden Valenciennner Passions*, Greifswald, 1907, and the related Greifswald dissertations by K. Mokross (1908), H. Schreiner (1907), and A. Kneisel (1906) and E. Streblow's *Le Mystère de Semur*, Greifswald, 1905; see also Roy, *op. cit. passim*, Stengel in *Z. F. S. L.*, xxix² (1906), 165 ff.; and Jeanroy, *Romania*, xxxv (1906), 365 ff., and *Journal des Savants* n. s. iv (1906), 476 ff.

¹⁸ See pp. 479-81.

¹⁹ Cf. Carleton Brown, "The Towneley Play of the Doctors and the Speculum Christiani," *Modern Language Notes*, xxxi, 223, and Hardin Craig, *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, E. E. T. S., Ext. Ser. 87, p. xxxiii.

²⁰ Marie C. Lyle, *The Original Identity of the York and Townley Cycles*, Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, 1919, vol. 8, no. 3. The views of Hohlfeld, Davidson, Pollard, Gayley and Cady are there summarized and a convenient bibliography for a study of the interrelations between the English cycles has been assembled. In my opinion, however, "identity" does not exclude "borrowing," but presupposes it. Cf. also the relation of the Shrewsbury fragments to the York *Shepherds* (Manly, *Specimens of*

among the religious plays of mediaeval Germany. Their complicated interrelations—their borrowings, revisions, *Doppelfassungen*, etc.—were first comprehensively studied by Ludwig Wirth, and from his discussions and chart not only geographical groups but radiating “spheres of influence” may be detected.²¹

Does this not suggest that in the hundreds of towns and villages of France, England and Germany where there were yearly (sometimes more frequent) performances of certain religious plays—plays whose framework was more or less imposed by their scriptural origin—many of the texts may have been practically replicas of each other? It is possible to assume of course that every town and village, every gild and *puy* had its own text, but from the evidence available it seems to me more likely that when a play was demanded upon a subject whose essentials were within certain limits immutable, the mediæval playwright felt no need of exerting himself unnecessarily, took what he needed where he found it, and devoted whatever talent he possessed to patching, arranging, and supplying such new scenes or extra-Biblical material as might prove striking and successful.²² We may indeed feel fairly confident that often when a Passion or other religious play was instituted in one community, the authorities frankly borrowed a text from elsewhere, perhaps commissioning some local celebrity to better it. Such a text might be repeatedly refurbished through a series of years, and might itself be lent at various stages in its career to other communities.

the Pre-Shaksperean Drama, 1897, I, xxviii ff.), and the situation in the *Ludus Coventriae* (*P. M. L. A.* xxxv, 324).

²¹ *Die Oster- und Passionsspiele*, Halle, 1889, 120-143. See also Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, I², 103-15, 224-33.

²² In *Modern Philology*, xv (1918), 565 ff., I attempted to study the *Revisions in the English Mystery Plays*.

Naturally by dint of the modifications introduced by many independent redactors, these plays would come in time to lose some of their earlier points of contact, and accordingly in their scanty remains today it is often difficult to postulate any original connection.

We seem to have, however, in the texts under discussion several versions, each generously revised, which have grown out of the same early archetype, and the application of the theory just advanced to the problem of their interrelations is obvious. If these texts represent the work of several redactors, each intent on remodelling an old play—a play moreover that probably came into the hands of each of them in somewhat different form—then the reasons for their likenesses and dissimilarities are patent. Their evolution involves both “inherited” and “acquired” characteristics. The mediæval clerk commissioned to manufacture their archetype—whether it was the Sion play or its ancestor—turned for his material to the Gospels, to liturgical plays, to stereotyped *Planctus Mariae*, to theological writers; he also turned to the narrative *Passion des Jongleurs*. He arranged, he adapted, he used his humble talents—and a play was evolved. His successors, the clerks who put together the plays preserved in the two manuscripts known as the *Passion d'Autun* and in the Palatine text, repeated the process, relying, however, first and foremost upon the results achieved by their predecessors. They in their turn shifted scenes, revised lines, eliminated and embellished according to their special needs and particular bents.²³ The intentions of the redactor

²³ That neither ms. of the Autun play is an “original” is shown not only by the relation of one to the other, but also by the presence in n. a. fr. 4085 of those narrative passages which have almost obscured its original dramatic form. As M. Jeanroy has said (*Journal des Savants*, 1906, p. 481), “les auteurs des deux manuscrits . . .

responsible for the *Palatine Passion* are readily discovered. He attempted to enliven the old text by curtailing certain scenes, putting others into strophic form,²⁴ and adding new realistic details of his own invention. His taste ran to devils, torturers, executioners and stanzaic structure. In his far humbler way he recalls the genius who refurbished certain plays in the Towneley cycle and thereby made it the most spirited of any of the English

lui ont fait subir deux genres d'altérations précisément contraires, l'un en y intercalant une foule de chevilles et de vers postiches, l'autre en abrégant systématiquement toutes les tirades." That the Palatine MS. is not an "original" is apparent from the manuscript itself, which, as Dr. Christ suggests, was probably intended for the use of readers rather than of actors (*op. cit.* 409). The absence of rubrics, however, is not unique in the French drama, as Dr. Christ believes. Cf. the MS. Bib. Nat. fr. 837 of the *Jeu de la Feuillée* (described in the edition in *Les Classiques français du moyen âge*, p. x). Cf. also the *Auto de los Reyes Magos* (ed. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, Madrid, 1900, p. 453).

²⁴ Dr. Christ fails to note how elaborate the stanzaic structure actually is. His analysis (*op. cit.*, p. 415-6) should be expanded and emended to include: (1) the octosyllabic stanzas of various forms in the *Descensus* scenes, *i. e.* ll. 1279-90 (aab ccb bbb bba), 1291-1303 (aab aab bba bba[a]), 1304-11 (abab abab)—this is cited by Christ, 1312-20 ([a]aabb ccaa), 1345-54 ([a]abab abab[b]), 1385-95 ([a]aabba abbaa), 1396-1401 (aab aab), 1402-9 (aabb aabb), 1410-19 (aabba abbaa), 1420-8 ([a]abab abce); (2) the double decasyllabic *seizain* containing the same rhymes in both halves, each half, however, preceded by an octosyllabic *quatrain monorime*, 1785-1824:

xxxx^s abab bccb dede effe^o
ffff^s aabb bccb dede edde^o

(3) the decasyllabic couplets, 923-6. Probably strophic in intention are also ll. 1977-86 (aabbb ecbbc), 1989-96 (aabb aacc), and possibly 1951-63 (aabbbbaaccedd) and 1914-24 (aabbaacxaaa). The (irregular) *sicains*, 35-52 are rhymed: aab ccb, aab bbe, aab bcc. Note also that the decasyllabic *Planctus* beginning l. 1071 exhibits stanzaic structure to l. 1087 (form somewhat uncertain, probably aba bbe cdd dde edd dd), from which to l. 1115 it continues in couplets with lines of varying lengths (six, seven and eight syllables).

cycles. That his distinctive innovations lent themselves to further use will be seen from a comparison of the Palatine text with some of the later French plays, notably with the *Passion de Semur*.

With the so-called Anglo-Norman *Résurrection*,²⁵ the *Passion d'Amboise*,²⁶ and the two plays on the Passion and Resurrection conserved in the Sainte-Geneviève manuscript,²⁷ the *Palatine Passion* has practically nothing in common except the scriptural background. The *Passion de Semur*,²⁸ however, belongs to the same general group as our text, despite certain borrowings from the *Passion Sainte-Geneviève*.²⁹ It is, to be sure, a much more highly

²⁵ Monmerqué et Michel, *Théâtre français au moyen âge*, Paris, 1839, pp. 11 ff. It has no connection with the thirteenth-century fragment of a *Résurrection* published by P. Meyer in *Romania* XXXIII (1904), 240-1.

²⁶ E. Picot, *Fragments inédits de mystères de la Passion*, *Romania* XIX (1890), 260 ff. There are in these fragments (known as the *Amboise Passion*) a few verbal resemblances to the Palatine text, but that they are fortuitous is obvious. Similarly, the fact that in both texts the thirty pieces of silver are counted out and the Crucifixion is accomplished upon the raised cross (rather than upon a cross which is later raised) must be ascribed to a common tradition and not to a common source.

²⁷ Jubinal, *Mystères inédits du XVe siècle*, Paris, 1837, II, 139 ff.; 312 ff. M. Roy, *op. cit.* 55* ff., has justly said that the Sainte-Geneviève plays do not derive from the *Passion des Jongleurs*.

²⁸ E. Roy, *Le Mystère de la Passion en France*, 73* ff.

²⁹ The supplementary sources of the Passion have been investigated by M. Roy. He overstates, however, the influence of the *Passion Sainte-Geneviève* upon the Semur play. The parallels cited by him at the foot of page 87* and extending through p. 88* are unconvincing, and although the six lines of the Apothecarius' speech (p. 87*) and the twenty-one lines of the Veronica incident are certain evidence of relationship, it can hardly be said that "la Passion de Semur n'est qu'un développement de la Passion Sainte-Geneviève" (p. 91*), or that it is "une simple imitation de la Passion Sainte-Geneviève" (p. 69*). These statements have been questioned by others. See Christ, *op. cit.* 415.

developed play, and has been extended not only to cover many more events but padded so as to treat those included at considerably greater length. In other words, it is a revised and composite work.

M. Roy recognized the dependence of the *Passion de Semur* upon the old *Passion des Jongleurs*³⁰ and M. Jeanroy has pointed out resemblances between it and the *Autun Passion*.³¹ Whether it used the narrative poem directly or through some intermediate dramatic source, itself derived from the poem, cannot be stated, although the second hypothesis seems the more likely. It resembles the *Palatine Passion* in scenes not present in the poem, and it resembles the poem in scenes not present in the *Palatine Passion*, but since a text incorporating all such scenes is not at hand we are left to conjecture. That, however, the *Passion de Semur* belongs to the Palatine and not to the Autun branch of the general tradition can, I think, be shown. The only incidents not included in the old narrative poem (a potential common source) which occur in the Semur and Autun texts but which do not appear in the Palatine play are the singing in the scene at the smith's—a minor detail—and the representation of the Crucifixion as taking place on a cross which is later elevated, instead of upon a cross already in position,³² a late addition in the Autun version since it occurs only in a narrative passage

³⁰ *Op. cit.* p. 85*.

³¹ *Journal des Savants*, 1906, p. 488. Note also his conclusion (p. 490) that the *Passion de Semur* is composed of fragments arbitrarily bound together.

³² Roy, *op. cit.* p. 85*, note 4, and *supra*, note 13, end. The narrative poem and the Palatine and Amboise texts conserve the earlier tradition regarding the Crucifixion. See Christ, *op. cit.* p. 480, note to ll. 878-926. This is one of the many instances in which the narrative passages of the Autun text are strikingly at variance with the narrative poem.

of MS. n. a. fr. 4085. At all other points the similarities between the Semur and Autun texts can be accounted for by passages in the old narrative poem and the tradition common to the Autun and Palatine plays.³³

This, however, is not the case in the parallels of phrase and incident found in the Semur and Palatine *Passions*. The more striking points of contact between the two plays, none of which emanates from the old poem or is present in the Autun version, are as follows: Pal. ll. 155-7 = Semur 6190-2; Pal. 249-258 = Sem. 6296-6307; Pal. 269-72 = Sem. 6311-16; Pal. 469-70 = Sem. 6639-40; Pal. 752-3 = Sem. 6992-3; Pal. 778-80 = Sem. 7091-3; the presence in both texts of the greetings of the *pueri Hebreorum* (Pal. 35 ff., Sem. 5567 ff.), the angel's words in the Garden of Gethsemane (Pal. 184-91, Sem. 6229 ff.), the missing pieces of silver (Pal. 211 ff., Sem. 6070 ff.), the scene where Pilate washes his hands (Pal. 742 ff., Sem. 6980 ff.),³⁴ the counting of the blows at the execution (Pal. 915 ff., Sem. 7424 ff.), and the scoffing at Jesus as a confessor of women (Pal. 946; Sem. 7415).

It is apparent, therefore, that the acquired characteristics of the Palatine version were transmitted. It can not be affirmed, however, that the redactor of the Semur *Passion* actually knew the very text preserved to us in the Palatine manuscript. Indeed if he had, he could hardly have refrained, one would think, from borrowing certain

³³ In such scenes as the bearing of the cross and the Veronica incident, which are not in the Palatine version but occur in the *Passion des Jongleurs*, the *Passion de Semur* and the *Passion d'Autun*, there are no independent verbal parallels between the Autun and the Semur texts.

³⁴ Dr. Christ attributes ll. 742-4 to *Li sergens* and ll. 745 ff. to *Pilates*, but both the context and the *Passion de Semur* seem to indicate that *Joel* speaks ll. 742-7, to which ll. 748 ff. are Pilate's reply.

passages of the *diablerie*, instead of resorting to a rather conventional treatment of the subject based more directly upon the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Tastes may differ, but it also seems to me that the Palatine Spice-merchant (ll. 1864 ff.) is a more engaging figure and exhibits more alluring charms than either of the Apothecarii in the Semur play (ll. 4872 ff., 8171 ff.). Be that as it may, it can hardly be doubted that the *Passion de Semur* incorporates certain elements taken from a group of plays strongly influenced by the old narrative poem, and that it belongs to the branch of that group represented by the Palatine rather than the Autun tradition.

An investigation of the relation of the *Palatine Passion* to the *Passions* included in the fully developed plays by Greban, Marcadé, Michel, etc., leads to no satisfactory results. The stages in the development of these great dramas have been traced by others, their derivations in large part established,³⁵ and they have all progressed so far from their origins that by extracting a few lines here and there reminiscent of the archaically simple plays which we have been considering one can submit no convincing proof of relationship.³⁶ That, however, the authors of these later plays unsparingly appropriated the work of their predecessors has long been recognized.

The custom of pouring old wine into new bottles, therefore, proves to have been practised from the earliest to the

³⁵ Cf. note 17, *supra*.

³⁶ It is noteworthy, however, that Greban, like the author of the *Palatine Passion* (and Rutebeuf in the *Miracle de Theophile*), rhymes *aaa'b**, a stanzaic form unknown to the other French Passion plays. Cf. H. Chatelain, *Recherches sur le vers français au XV^e siècle*, Paris, 1908, pp. 87-8. (Chatelain's examples taken from Greban's *Passion* and erroneously entered under the caption *aaa'b** should be included with those from the same work correctly cited as rhyming *aaa'b**.)

latest times. Just as the two Valenciennes *Passions* represent a mosaic of passages deriving from older plays (Greban's and Michel's *Passions*, the *Passion d'Arras*, two *mystères* portraying the life of the Virgin, the *Mystère du Viel Testament*, and unknown compilations made from these),³⁷ so it can be shown by comparing the *Palatine Passion* with the various texts related to it that this earliest of French Passion plays is itself a composite work. Traces of the popular *Passion des Jongleurs*, of an earlier play or plays, and of later additions and revisions can all be detected in the text that has survived. Moreover, the same process of borrowing and redacting that evolved the *Palatine Passion* was employed in the production of the two versions of the *Passion d'Autun* and of the *Passion de Semur*, and it is to this process, I believe, that most of the similarities and dissimilarities apparent in these texts are to be attributed.

GRACE FRANK.

³⁷ See especially B. Koeppen, *op. cit.* p. 13.